



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,083	09/29/2003	Lowell E. Kolb	10010908-2	2175

7590 05/03/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

GLENN, KIMBERLY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2817

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,083

Applicant(s)

KOLB ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly E. Glenn

Art Unit

2817

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-28, 30-32, 34-39, 41-48, 51-58, 60-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 29, 33, 40, 49, 50 and 59 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 50 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 49. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 27, 31, 34-39, 42, 43-55, 57, 58 and 61 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claim 27, a circuit board ground plane is disclosed in line 3. Is this the same circuit board ground plane that is disclosed in claim 26 or a different circuit board ground plane?

Claims 31 and 52 recites the limitation "the conductor" and " the electrical filter connector" in lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 34 recites the limitation "the received power signal" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 35 recites the limitation "the conductive coating" in lines 1 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

With regards to claims 36, examiner is unsure what element applicant is referring to with the limitation "the arrangement of the selected element of the circuit board". Examiner is also unsure which receiver loop applicant is referring to in line 3 of the claim. Claim 36 also recites the limitation "the field coupling characteristics" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 37 recites the limitation "the surface mount capacitor" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 38 recites the limitation "the ground via", "the ground terminal" and "the capacitor" in lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 39 recites the limitation "the external field" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "the conductor" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

With regard to claim 46, a ground via is disclosed in line 2. Is this the same ground via that is disclosed in claim 42 or a different ground via?

Claim 47 recites the limitation "the electrical filter components" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 48 recites the limitation "the noise suppression signals" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

With regard to claim 57, interconnect post and a ground plane are disclosed in line 2. Are these the same interconnect post and ground plane that are disclosed in claim 56 or a different interconnect post and ground plane?

With regard to claim 58, a first ground land and interconnecting traces are disclosed in line 2. Are these the same first ground land and interconnecting traces that are disclosed in claim 57 or a first ground land and interconnecting traces?

Claim 61 recites the limitation "the electrical connector " in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 25-28, 30-32, 35, 37, 38, 41-47, 51, 52, 55-58 and 60- 62 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,485. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each

discloses circuits comprising of a interconnect post, a first receiver loop, a second or (suppressor) receiver loop, a electrical filter, a conductive coating, a ground plane and ground via.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 29, 33, 40, 49, 50 and 59 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Akiba et al US Patent 5,491,301, Higgins III US Patent 5,639,989, Nakatani et al US Patent 5,341,274 and Kohya US Patent 6,521,843.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly E. Glenn whose telephone number is (571)-272-1761. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (571)-272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimberly E Glenn
Examiner
Art Unit 2817

keg



Robert Pascal
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800